

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claims 25-31 and 33-39 remain pending in this application, with claim 25 being independent. Claims 32 and 40-51 have been cancelled.

Claims 48-51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,787,037 (Amanai). Claims 48-51 have been cancelled, therefore this rejection is moot.

Claims 25-31 and 33-36 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Amanai, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,557,572 (Sawada). In addition, claims 32, 37-39, 51 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Amanai and Sawada, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,016,270 (Thummalapally). Applicant respectfully traverses.

According to the Examiner, Amanai and Sawada, combined, teach each and every element recited in the claims except for a memory array controller comprising a second block controller to apply a signal to a second block with said memory array to read a memory cell of the second block substantially simultaneously with erasure of a first block with said memory array. In addition, the Examiner states that Thummalapally teaches this missing element of a second block controller. The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to combine Amanai, Sawada and Thummalapally because a person skilled in the art would perform erase and read operations simultaneously on different blocks in a memory array in order to improve performance of the memory device. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Amended claim 25 teaches a memory array and a memory array controller 400. The memory controller comprises at least first 420 and second 440 block controllers. By contrast, Thummalapally comprises a memory array 12 that is subdivided into a

plurality of individually accessible array memory cell blocks 14. Applicant's independent claim 25 claims a memory array controller that contains two block controllers not a memory array having a plurality of cell blocks as shown Thummalapally.

Thummalapally's memory cell block 14 would be similar to Applicant's memory array 460 having block one 462 and block two 466 but not to Applicant's memory array controller having a first and second block controllers. Nowhere do the combined references teach or suggest a memory array controller having a first and second block controller as recited in amended claim 25.

In summary, for the reasons noted above, Claims 25-31 and 33-39 are distinguished over the cited art and are in condition for allowance. It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth herein, the applicable rejections and objections have been overcome. Favorable action is respectfully solicited. Allowance of the Claims is respectfully requested.

Please charge any additional charges to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 3/22/04


John Patrick Ward
Reg. No. 40,216

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030
(408) 720-8300